

REMARKS

At the outset, the Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated May 10, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

The Applicant further thanks the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the case with Applicant's representative on July 13, 2006.

Claims 1, 6, 7 and 9 are hereby amended and claims 12-14 are newly added. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to claim 6 for informalities noted therein. The Applicants have corrected claim 6 accordingly, and ask the Examiner to withdraw this objection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant's Prior Art Admission (hereinafter "APAA"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicant respectfully submits that APAA does not teach every element recited in claims 1-6 and therefore cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a cabinet cover which includes, among other features, "a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member is attached to the rear side of said cabinet cover body with a weld joint formed at the peripheral edge of the aesthetic member." APAA fails to disclose these features.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over APAA, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2-6, which depend from claim 1 are also patentable for at least the same reasons

The Office Action rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APAA in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,018,131 to *Snider* (hereinafter "*Snider*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish prima facie obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." The Applicants submit that neither APAA nor *Snider* either singularly or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element recited in claims 1-11.

Regarding claims 1-6, claim 1 has been amended to recite a cabinet cover which includes, among other features, "a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member is attached to the rear side of said cabinet cover body with a weld joint formed at the peripheral edge of the aesthetic member." Neither of the references either singularly or in combination, disclose these features.

As correctly pointed out in the Office Action at page 4, APAA does not disclose "a joint disposed about a peripheral edge of the member formed by welding." *Snider* is introduced to overcome the deficiencies of APAA, specifically to teach "that it was known in the art at the time the invention was made to employ an array of attaching means/methods for attaching a member to a body." While *Snider* may teach attaching means using adhesive and welding, they are used in separate applications. *Snider* fails to teach or fairly suggest using both adhesive and welding means in a single application. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify APAA in view of *Snider*.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 is patentably distinguishable over APAA in view of *Snider* and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2-6, which depend from claim 1 are also patentable for at least the same reason as discussed above

Regarding claims 7 and 8, claim 7 has been amended to recite "the aesthetic member being attached to the rear of the cabinet cover body with an adhesive agent and a weld joint formed about a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member." Neither of the references either singularly or in combination, disclose these features.

As correctly pointed out in the Office Action at page 4, APAA does not disclose “a joint disposed about a peripheral edge of the member formed by welding.” *Snider* is introduced to overcome the deficiencies of APAA, specifically to teach “that it was known in the art at the time the invention was made to employ an array of attaching means/methods for attaching a member to a body.” While *Snider* may teach attaching means using adhesive and welding, they are used in separate applications. *Snider* fails to teach or fairly suggest using both adhesive and welding means in a single application. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify APAA in view of *Snider*.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 is patentably distinguishable over APAA in view of *Snider* and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claim 8, which depends from claim 7 is also patentable for at least the same reason as discussed above

Regarding claim 9, claim 9 has been amended to recite an “said aesthetic member is welded to the rear side of said cabinet cover body with a weld joint at a peripheral edge of said aesthetic member” Neither of the references either singularly or in combination, disclose these features.

As correctly pointed out in the Office Action at page 4, APAA does not disclose “a joint disposed about a peripheral edge of the member formed by welding.” *Snider* is introduced to overcome the deficiencies of APAA, specifically to teach “that it was known in the art at the time the invention was made to employ an array of attaching means/methods for attaching a member to a body.” While *Snider* may teach attaching means using adhesive and welding, they are used in separate applications. *Snider* fails to teach or fairly suggest using both adhesive and welding means in a single application. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify APAA in view of *Snider*.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 is patentably distinguishable over APAA in view of *Snider* and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 10-11, which depend from claim 9 are also patentable for at least the same reason as discussed above.

Newly added claims 12-14 are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on the allowable claims 1, 7 and 9.

The application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: October 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By


Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant